

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE

MINUTES OF THE
Academic Senate
Tuesday, January 21, 1997
UU 220, 3:00-5:00pm

Preparatory: The meeting opened at 3:10pm.

- I. Minutes: none.
- II. Communications and Announcements:
- III. Reports:
 - A. Academic Senate Chair:
 - B. President's Office:
 - C. Provost's Office: Provost Zingg is forming two committees: the Advisory Committee on Admissions and an Advisory Committee on Budget Planning (formerly PACBRA). Several existing committees are being polled in an attempt to coordinate Cal Poly's efforts toward recruitment and retention of faculty of color.
 - D. Statewide Senators:
 - E. CFA Campus President:
 - F. Staff Council Representative:
 - G. ASI Representative:
 - H. IACC Representative:
 - I. Athletics Governing Board Representative: J Brown announced that the Board is presently working on NAACP certification and its report will be circulated on campus for comment early spring quarter.
 - J. Other:
- IV. Consent Agenda:
- V. Business Items:
 - A. **Resolution on General Education and Breadth Program: Proposed Administrative Structure, first reading:** A summary of the discussion follows. (Johnston) It should be stated at the beginning of first reading that the procedures recommended for deliberation of this matter can be suspended by the body if it wishes. (Lutrin) How will the order of alternative reports be determined for voting purposes? It would be useful if the Senate office time/date-stamped the reports in the order received. (Greenwald) The caucuses will have to make some decisions as to how they want to deal with the reports from their college.

(Hampsey) The report before us reflects the thinking of the ad hoc committee over the past two years. It's felt that GE&B is an academic program and should have a reporting structure similar to other programs. Last year, the three main issues that arose were access, numbers, and power. We hope those concerns have been addressed in this new resolution.

(Gooden) Will the director have a budget? (Zingg) It's safe to assume this would be the case. (Levenhagen) Who answers to the director? (Hampsey) We don't see the director getting involved in personnel issues.

(Harris) I would like to see additional verbiage regarding "technology" added to the section on Conceptual Goals of the GE&B Program. (Amspacher) Define "technology" for me. Loading the subcommittees with faculty from CLA and CSM seems to make "technology" a lesser subject area. (Murphy) Courses submitted in the past define what "technology" courses are appropriate for this area. (Irvin) Bill's right in saying "technology" needs further clarification. These definitions will change the array of subcommittees.

(LaCascio) How will we know if the skills noted in the report have been achieved? (Irvin) That's a good question. This is an issue the committee will have to look into. Assessment is a charge of the committee.

(Harris) I have three suggestions: (1) Under Appointment of GE&B Committee Members, clarify what "consultation with the Academic Senate" means. (2) Add the need for assigned time; build it into the proposal. (3) Under the qualifications for director, clarify what the intention is of "normally the director will be a faculty member in either CLA or CSM". (4) A termination clause limiting length of membership should be added.

(Smidt) As the chair of the standing GE&B Committee for the past two years, I have found little continuity with its current structure. The current committee doesn't know what past committees have done. Communications are ghastly. Conflicting documents show up. Getting some continuity is crucial to GE&B especially with the four-unit policy in place. GE&B needs a fresh start. I support this report even though I disagree with some of its points.

(Morrobel-Sosa) Although there are specific procedures that will evolve from the committee once it is in place, since we will be voting on the initial duties and responsibilities of this committee, I would like to have articulated: (1) the administrative structure of the program, (2) who the director responds to, (3) the conceptual goals of the program (especially in view of the difference between Cal Poly and other CSUs), and (4) the accountability of the committee - the curricular aspects subject to internal and external review. I understand things need to be changed from what they are now, but it's important to remember students are coming from all colleges and elimination of one college from the membership affects students from that college. (Murphy) We have to remember that whatever the committee comes up with goes to the whole Senate and all deans. If something causes an uproar continually, this will render the committee useless. This understanding is an oversight of the committee's functionability.

(Bertozzi) suggested the following wording be added to the second paragraph under the section Responsibility for the GE&B Program: "The provost submits the GEB proposals to the Academic Senate for review and recommendations for its approval, disapproval, or modifications," and under Appointment of GEB Committee Members, "The provost appoints GEB Committee members after consultation confirmation with the Academic Senate."

(Lang) Can units of a course be broken down for partial credit in one area and partial credit in another? (Irvin) Yes, to some degree this presently occurs.

The Chair summarized the process for deliberation of this resolution by stating:

1. The GE&B Ad Hoc Committee will submit any revisions to the Senate office by January 24.
2. The Senate office will transmit changes to the campus on January 27.
3. "Alternative reports" must be received by the Senate office by 5pm on February 4. There will be no exceptions to this deadline. Only that portion of the report suggested for change should constitute the alternative report.
4. If senators have any further thoughts, email these to John Hampsey before 4:30 on January 22.

5. At second reading, alternative reports must be moved by a senator in order to acted upon.

The resolution was agendized for second reading at the next Senate meeting.

- B. **Resolution on the Establishment of a Summer Advising Program Committee, first reading:** Swartz gave the background on this resolution stating the current program performs a vital service to the campus but lacks a formal structure. This resolution provides a clear identity and structure for the program. It may, however, be subsumed by a more global organization created by the following resolution. (Breitenbach) Much of the work will continue to be performed by volunteers. There are no funding consequences to this resolution. It's hoped the resolution will be broaden advising efforts, add continuity, and bring attention to the services being provided. The resolution was agendized for second reading at the next Senate meeting.
- C. **Resolution on the 1996 Student Advising Survey: Report and Recommendations for Future Action, first reading:** Stanton provided the background to this resolution. The resolution is the results of a survey of needs assessment made to students asking them what they wanted in an advising program. (Martinez) suggested the last Resolved clause be changed to read: "RESOLVED: That the Task Force ~~should~~ shall report back to the Academic Senate..." The resolution was agendized for second reading at the next Senate meeting.
- D. **Resolution on Department Name Change for the Agricultural Education Department, first reading:** This resolution will return as a first-reading item on the next Academic Senate agenda.
- E. **Resolution on Department Name Change for the Foreign Languages and Literatures Department, first reading:** The resolution was agendized for second reading at the next Senate meeting.

VI. Discussion Items:

VII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 4:58pm.

Submitted by:



Margaret Camuso
Academic Senate